V. REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-tight double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of co-pending Application Numbers 10/697,249; 10/697,237; 10/697,441; 10/697,004; 10/697,259; 10/697,054; and, 10/697,251.

The issue in addressing the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting is whether any claim of the application defines merely an obvious variation of the invention claimed in the earlier patent. It does not prohibit a later claiming of subject matter that is disclosed but not claimed in the earlier patent or application. Double patenting is concerned with attempts to "claim" related subject matter twice. **In re Gibbs**, 437 F.2d 486, 168 USPQ 578 (CCPA 1971). Under the rules of practice, the United States Patent and Trademark Office must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness-type double-patenting or the rejection, if applied, will be reversed by the Board of Patent Appeals.

The United States Patent and Trademark Office is obligated to clearly set forth the basis of an obviousness-type double-patenting rejection. Under MPEP 804 II. B. 1., it states:

> Any obviousness-type double patenting rejection should make clear:
>
> (A) The differences between the inventions defined in the conflicting claims--a claim in the patent compared to a claim in the application; and
>
> (B) The reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim in issue is an obvious variation of the invention defined in a claim in the patent.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper because the United States Patent and Trademark Office fails to make clear the obviousness-type double patenting rejection, particularly subparagraphs (A) and (B) above as applied to each one of Application Numbers 10/697,249; 10/697,237; 10/697,441; 10/697,004; 10/697,259; 10/697,054; and, 10/697,251. Furthermore, the claims are amended in a manner to obviate the rejection. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that the United States Patent and Trademark Office fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness-type double patenting.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. The claims are amended to obviate the rejection.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Loose (U.S. Patent No. 6,517,433). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Loose teaches a spinning reel slot machine that includes a plurality of mechanical rotatable reels and a video display. In response to a wager, the reels are rotated and stopped to randomly place symbols on the reels in visual association with a display area. The video display provides a video image superimposed upon the reels. The video image may be interactive with the reels and include such graphics as payout values, a pay table, pay lines, bonus game features, special effects, thematic scenery, and instructional information.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a gaming machine that includes:

a game result display device for displaying a game result thereon, the game result display device including a first display device and a second display device in arranged in front of the first display device; and

a beneficial state generating device for generating a beneficial state for a player when a specific game result is displayed on the game result display device.

Claim 1 recites that an image displayed on the second display device is generated by synthesizing a plurality of images based on a priority order and a symbol display area of the second display device through which the first display device is seen and recognized, is realized by displaying a predetermined image with higher priority order among the plural images. Additionally, claim 1 recites that the second display device is constructed from a liquid crystal display device including a liquid crystal panel, a light guide device arranged and a rear side of the liquid crystal panel, an illumination device for generating light which is guided to the light guide device and a reflection device for reflecting light guided to the light guide device toward the liquid crystal panel arranged in front of the light guide device.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper because the applied art fails to teach each element of claim 1 as amended. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach a second display device that is constructed from a liquid crystal display device including a liquid crystal panel, a light guide device arranged and a rear side of the liquid crystal panel, an illumination device for generating light which is guided to the light guide device and a reflection device for reflecting light guided to the light guide device toward the liquid crystal panel arranged in front of the light guide device. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Claims 3 and 5 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Loose in view of Muir (PCT WO 3039699 A1). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Muir teaches a liquid crystal multilayer structure.

Claims 2, 4 and 6 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite. For instance, claim 2 recites that the reflection device is provided with plural areas, each of which corresponds to each reel, and the areas being made light transmittable.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 also includes features not shown in the applied art.

Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to submit those other reasons and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein in future papers.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 2, 2006

By: _____
Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal
Petition for Extension of Time (three months)

DC250454.DOC